Case 1:14-cv-03728-KBF Document 84 Filed 04/09/15 Page 1 of 2

Case 1:14-cv-03728-KBF Document 81 Filed 04/08/

Margaret M. Zwisler
Direct Dial: 202-637-1092
margaret.zwisler@lw.com

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

April 8, 2015

VIA ECF

The Honorable Katherine B. Forrest United States District Court Southern District of New York United States Courthouse 500 Pearl Street, Room 1950 New York, New York 10007-1312

Re: In re Zinc Antitrust Litig., No. 14 Civ. 3728 (KBF)

04/08/15 Page 1 of 2

555 Elevent USD G. W. Sund 1000

Washington, B. 6. 2004 PENT
Tel: +1.202.637.2200 Fax: +1.202.637.2201

www.lw.comELECTRONICALLY FILED

FIRM / ART IDDOCF#ICES

Abu Dhat Barcelona Beijing

Boston New Jersey

Brussels New York

Orange County Century City Chicago Paris Doha Riyadh Dubai Rome Düsseldorf San Diego Frankfurt San Francisco Hamburg Shanghai Silicon Valley Hong Kong Houston Singapore London Tokvo Washington, D.C. Los Angeles

Madrid

Dear Judge Forrest:

This is in response to the Court's expressed interest in understanding the LME's position concerning the request of the zinc plaintiffs for a 30 day extension of the time to file a consolidated amended complaint.

First, the LME defendants did not object to the request; counsel for plaintiffs never contacted the LME to discuss it. They contacted counsel for the other defendants, who informed them that they would "need to talk separately with the LME's counsel." They have not done so. Thus, I was surprised to see the letter request for the extension come across the court's electronic filing system last night. Had plaintiffs contacted me, I would have informed them that we do not object to their request for a 30 day extension of time to file their consolidated amended complaint in zinc.

We do object to their apparent intention to name any of the LME entities as defendants on that complaint, however. As I have told Ms. Nussbaum, it is our position that this Court's orders in the aluminum case, granting the LME's motion to dismiss on sovereign immunity grounds (D.I. 564) and the motions of HKEx and LME Holdings to dismiss on personal jurisdiction grounds (D.I. 728) govern plaintiffs' ability to state a claim against those same entities in the zinc complaint as well. Thus, it is a waste of the LME defendants' and the Court's resources to require the LME defendants to re-brief both of those issues in the zinc case and the Court to decide them again. This is the subject upon which we are conferring with Ms. Nussbaum. It is my hope that the parties' discussions on this topic will resolve the issue without any need for Court action.

Case 1:14-cv-03728-KBF Document 84 Filed 04/09/15 Page 2 of 2

Case 1:14-cv-03728-KBF Document 81 Filed 04/08/15 Page 2 of 2

April 8, 2015 Page 2

LATHAM&WATKINS LLP

If you have any further questions, please let me know.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Margaret M. Zwisler
Margaret M. Zwisler

cc: All Counsel of Record (via ECF)

Ordered

Plaintiff's request for extension

Sur forth is Their Litter of

as sur forth is Their Litter of

April 7, 2015 is granted.

April 7, 2015 is granted.

4/9/15